

Ohio University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Monday, October 18, 2010
Room 235, Margaret M. Walter Hall, 7:10 p.m.
Minutes Approved 1/24/11

The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Joe McLaughlin at 7:09 p.m.

In attendance:

College of Arts and Sciences: E. Ammarell, K. Brown, C. Elster, J. Gilliom, S. Gradin, S. Hays, K. Hicks, D. Ingram, J. Lein, J. McLaughlin, R. Palmer, S. Patterson, B. Quitslund, L. Rice, W. Roosenburg, S. Wyatt

College of Business: T. Stock

College of Fine Arts: M. Phillips, A. Reilly, E. Sayrs, D. Thomas

College of Health Sciences and Professions: M. Adeyanju, D. Bolon

College of Osteopathic Medicine: A. Huzoor, J. Wolf

Group II: H. Burstein, M. Sisson

Patton College of Education and Human Services: A. Paulins

Regional Campus—Chillicothe: R. Knight, N. Kiersey

Regional Campus—Eastern: J. Casebolt

Regional Campus—Lancaster: P. Munhall

Regional Campus—Southern: M. Crawford for D. Marinski

Regional Campus—Zanesville: J. Farley for J. Benson, P. Kanwar for M. Nern

Russ College of Engineering: J. Dill, J. Giesey, D. Gulino for B. Branham, H. Pasic

Scripps College of Communication: B. Debatin, J. Lee, G. Newton, J. Slade, S. Titsworth

Excused: T. Franklin, T. Heckman

Absent: L. Hoshower, B. Roach, D. McDiarmid, J. Thomas

Overview of the Meeting:

- I. M. Marnette Perry, Chair, Board of Trustees
- II. President McDavis
- III. Roll Call and Approval of the September 20, 2010 Minutes
- IV. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin
 - Merit Raise Pool Distribution
 - University Furlough Policy
 - Ohio Faculty Council Elections & Report
 - Announcement of Upcoming Events
 - A Resolution on Process to Determine Necessity of Furloughs
 - **Upcoming Senate Meeting: November 15, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**
- V. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom
 - Sense of the Senate Resolution on 2010 Raise Pool Procedures (First Reading)
- VI. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin
 - Resolution Faculty Fellowship Leave and Deferral for Curricular Reasons (First Reading)
 - Resolution on Role of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Professional Ethics Violations (First Reading)
- VII. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade
- VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly
- IX. New Business

X. Adjournment

McLaughlin began by recognizing David Thomas and John Gilliom, the two Faculty Senators who act as representatives to the Board of Trustees, as well as Kyle Triplett, student trustee. McLaughlin then introduced M. Marnette Perry, Chair of the Board of Trustees.

I. M. Marnette Perry, Chair, Board of Trustees

Chair Perry began by thanking the Faculty Senate for inviting her to speak with them, and thanked faculty for all that they do for Ohio University. Perry stated that she is pleased to be part of a Board that is focused on academic mission. She emphasized that vision, mission, and strategic priorities are critically important, and that developing these requires an iterative process. Perry thanked the faculty who had worked on VisionOhio as it has evolved into the current vision statement and six strategic priorities.

At the recent Board retreat, the Board confirmed the six strategic priorities, and then focused on three areas: 1) the environmental scan; 2) OU's financial strength; and 3) the Board's process for decision making so that strategic decisions are made at the appropriate time of year. The outcomes of the retreat included: 1) Requesting more refinement of the six strategic priorities; 2) Pushing for actions/plans around financial strength; 3) Developing clarity on how committees will make decisions so that committees can take a deeper look at issues on behalf of the whole trustee group.

Perry emphasized the Board's interest in increasing the financial strength of the OU, which is currently weaker than desired. The Trustees are primarily concerned with several measures of financial strength. 1) The reserve ratio: the expendable net assets divided by total operating expenses. This is 50% of Senate Bill 6 scoring, and the Trustees have asked for a six-year plan to address this. 2) The net income ratio: the change in total assets to total revenue ratio. OU is at the low end of the desired range. 3) The viability ratio: assets to debt ratio (also included in Senate Bill 6 scoring). 4) The debt ratio: debt to operating expenses ratio. This impacts the cost of capital. OU's debt ratio is not out of range, but low enough that it significantly impacts debt decisions.

For any decisions made, the impact on OU's financial strength will be a critical component. Priorities include increasing efficiency, making sure growth plans are the right size, carefully considering any debt decisions, building a billion dollar endowment, and positioning OU competitively in terms of faculty compensation. Perry noted that the Board had pushed to include improving faculty compensation as one of the six strategic priorities, and thought that this year's 1% across-the-board raise and additional raise pools for merit and instruction were a step in the right direction. Perry concluded by emphasizing that the Board is focusing on long-term success, and that faculty are a very important part of that. Perry then asked for questions.

A lengthy discussion ensued, focusing on the role, cost, and benefits of intercollegiate athletics (ICA) at Ohio University.

Steve Hays noted that there is considerable faculty concern about ICA, and asked Perry what she understood the faculty concerns to be. Perry responded that ICA is a difficult issue for most universities, and referred to a recent article by Brit Kirwan (a member of the Knight Commission) that outlines these issues. She noted that athletics are very important to the student experience, but that we have to keep asking ourselves and our students what the right kind of experience is, and make sure that OU is balanced. **Hays** replied that the chief concern is that the current subsidy of ICA is unsustainable, and puts us at a competitive disadvantage with other institutions because spending on ICA impacts the amount of money that can be spent on academic resources. Perry agreed that we can't operate at a disadvantage, and emphasized that it is critical to find the right size for ICA. She added that the Board has to try to foresee any

unintended consequences that might result from any changes, and that the student experience is at the core of any cost/benefit analysis of ICA.

Charlotte Elster noted that there are at least two ways that athletics impact the student experience. One is passive: the student watching someone else engage in athletics; the other is active: the student engaging directly in athletics through intramurals, club sports, and so on. Right now the emphasis is on the passive experience, and there needs to be more balance. **Judith Lee** asked whether that had been any discussion of recent data about football and concussions and other injuries (e.g. the strong correlation with early-onset Alzheimer's), and whether the Board had considered the ethics of continuing football, as well as possible associated liabilities. Perry stated that the Board is aware of these issues, and that we should always move toward safety as new information is discovered. **Bernhard Debatin** emphasized that there are two types of sports; intramural and intercollegiate, and argued that intramural sports is where the central student experience is, and asked whether we should look at a shift toward intramurals. He then noted that the MAC is an immense cost driver, and asked whether Perry was willing to help make some change happen at the MAC level. Perry responded that this is an important question without an easy answer; she acknowledged that ICA was an irritant for many faculty, and noted that she was not arguing that we should keep the status quo. **Lorie Lapierre** argued that the student experience should include their classroom experience: in one class, class size increased from 69 to 182. Why support athletics when the impact on academics is so severe? Perry stated that this was not the spirit of what the Board intends. **Lapierre** then asked why it is happening. Perry asked what she should take away from this conversation, and what the faculty recommended doing. **Hays** argued that students should be told exactly what ICA costs them (\$100/month), and then have a referendum to ask students whether they want to still support ICA at the expense of academics; include the possibility of moving to Division III (without athletic scholarships). Perry clarified that the premise was that the student would pay the same amount, but that it would go toward academics rather than toward ICA. **McLaughlin** added that the main idea Perry should take away is that this campus is desperate for a genuine campus-wide discussion on the right size for athletics. **James Casebolt** clarified that last cut of athletics was actually to intramural and club sports, not ICA.

McLaughlin then asked for questions about other topics. **Ken Hicks** asked how the Board felt about tuition caps in a time of declining state subsidies, and whether we can depend on a state subsidy over the long term. Perry responded that the Board has a history of supporting tuition increases, but that keeping education affordable is also a high priority. Counting on the state subsidy over the long term is not an effective strategy. **Luis Clemente** asked how the Board viewed the role of contingent faculty in supporting the student experience. Perry responded that the administration shapes that decision, and deferred the question to President McDavis. **Joe Slade** reiterated that ICA was overriding concern, and that there seemed to be a disconnect between the Board and the faculty. He asked Perry to be aware that, from a faculty perspective, academic programs are being starved, and morale among faculty is grim, with many colleagues who are trying to leave. Perry responded that although the Board works at the strategic rather than the managerial level, improving faculty morale, keeping faculty pay competitive, and keeping faculty workloads in check was vital; it may seem like shallow words, but it is a top priority for the Board. **Michael Sisson** asked why Perry referred Clemente's question about Group II faculty to McDavis. Perry responded that the administration really shapes that issue, not the Board.

McLaughlin concluded by thanking Perry for coming, and noted that communication between faculty and the Board of Trustees has improved tremendously over the last 3-4 years, and that he hopes the tradition of annual visits to Faculty Senate by the Chair will continue.

II. President McDavis

President McDavis began by addressing the question about contingent faculty, noting that while different faculty may have different roles, every faculty member is valued. McDavis then reported that he had presented the resolution on the sustainability of ICA (passed by Faculty Senate last spring) to the MAC Council of Presidents at a recent meeting. The resolution was well received, and was discussed for 45 minutes. The general sense was that the issue of how ICA is financed is very important both to the MAC and to individual schools, and a commitment was made to keep talking about these issues at the winter meeting, to make cuts responsibly, and to support academics. McDavis then noted that athletics funding across the MAC is less than 5% of budget, while the average for Division 1a is 5.5%. The range of athletic budgets in the MAC is from 17 – 26 million; the mean budget is 22 million, while OU's budget is 21 million. As a conference, the Mac is in the 4th quartile in terms of how much is spent. The MAC schools project flat budgets for next 10 years. The MAC Council of Presidents accepted the spirit of the resolution, had a healthy conversation, and will continue these conversations.

Ken Brown said that looking at the athletic budget compared to other schools is one perspective. The other perspective is that we put more money into ICA than any other academic college except Arts and Sciences—ICA is the second largest College. McDavis responded that we can also look at it from perspective of how we fund: through the general fee, and there is support from students for what we fund. McDavis agreed that we need to have a conversation about these issues. **Hays** argued that it is not relevant that we are in the 4th quartile for expenditures; the issue is how much we're losing. How can we say that \$1 out of every \$20 or \$25 should go to something where people sit and watch, instead of academics? Faculty also pointed out that attendance at both football and basketball is sparse, so it is not clear that this has a widespread impact on the student experience. McDavis said that he would have to check the attendance numbers, but that there are many parts to the student experience, and that they are trying to figure out how we continue to provide a wide array of experiences for students who come to this university.

Debatin argued that it was not very helpful to talk about athletics as a unit, because there are many different experiences (e.g. intramural sports) that we have neglected. He added that it is problematic in times of scarcity and potential furloughs to say that we do need the "Cadillac" of ICA; ICA is just one part of the athletic experience. We need to figure out which student athletic experiences are sustainable; what we have isn't sustainable. McDavis said that he did not disagree, and when we engage in the conversation about cuts across the institution, we have to look at every area for cuts. McDavis said that he understands the concerns that this body has expressed about ICA; he brought these concerns forward to the MAC group of Presidents, and he is going to continue pursuing this.

Hicks thanked McDavis for taking the courageous step to bring this to the MAC. Hicks added that students and parents are not aware how much they are paying for the student experience of athletics, and wondered what students would say if they were aware of how much they were paying. **Slade** also thanked McDavis for bringing this forward, and added that this is a challenge we should embrace: the real problem is that all of these universities are afraid to be the first ones to find a way to get out from under what has become an intolerable burden. McDavis said that the conversation focused on what we could do to balance the spending between athletics and academics, but that he did not sense support for getting rid of athletics at the division 1A level. There was a commitment to come to grips with the balance between spending on athletics vs. ICA, both individually and across the MAC. **Rudy Pasic** emphasized that the students have to be consulted. McDavis agreed, and said that he meets with randomly selected students every other week. Helaine Burstein noted that, as a die-hard football fan, she had experienced football at both Division III and Division I schools. **Burstein** asked what the problem would be from the

point of view of the student experience if we were in Division III, especially since the MAC as a whole is highly subsidized. McDavis responded that the MAC as a conference was in better financial shape under the new commissioner, and said that there were differences between Divisions I and III. **Burstein** agreed, but asked what the difference was to the student experience. McDavis said that we would have to talk about that in conversation with students. **McLaughlin** concluded that it was very difficult for institutions to address these issues, thanked McDavis for bringing this to MAC and for reporting back to us, and said that he looked forward to hearing more about it in the future.

III. David Descutner (Executive Vice Provost and Dean of University College, for Provost Benoit)

Descutner opened the floor to questions about the process for distributing this year's merit raise pool and the recently-circulated draft furlough policy.

Debatin noted that if faculty are not allowed to work on furlough days, and cannot cancel classes for a furlough, then we will be working fewer days: will we cut back on research, and how will that affect P&T? Descutner responded that he assumed that would be dealt with at the College level, but this has not yet been determined.

Then discussion turned to the \$750,000 raise pool announced earlier in the fall. The Provost and Deans imposed a cap on the percentage of faculty who could be awarded merit raises: in the College of Arts and Sciences, up to 50% of faculty could be awarded merit raises; in the other Colleges, only 25%-33% of faculty could be awarded merit raises. Regional campuses had a slightly different system for implementing merit raises. **Hicks** said that there were a lot of rumors about how merit raises were structured, and asked Descutner to explain how this process was decided. Descutner responded that the Deans (except Dean Ogles) uniformly agreed on the Provost's approach; Ogles argued for a different system based on the culture in the College of Arts and Sciences. **Brown** said that therefore we have a system with arbitrary limits, and then different arbitrary limits between colleges. Descutner responded that there was a 1% across the board raise; the additional pool has always been always described as merit raise, and agreement was reached that between 25-33% of faculty would receive merit pay. Descutner further argued that there had to be a cutoff at some point, and that this was a reasonable way to go; he further noted that several faculty he works with have been happy with the raises. **Brown** responded that the system assumes that outstanding faculty are distributed evenly across the faculty. So really deserving faculty are going to be left out, and in other cases mediocre faculty will get the raise. Descutner responded that there was no way to do this so everyone is pleased. **Brown** asked why each academic unit was not allowed to decide how to distribute its merit raises. Descutner replied that there's no philosophical problem with that, but there are reservations about how merit is distributed (e.g. widely in A&S, but narrowly in Communications). **Brown** repeated that that was not his question: why can't each academic department decide how to distribute raises, based on their current peer evaluation process for determining merit. Descutner asked what was wrong with the Dean making that decision? **Brown** responded that the homogeneity is inappropriate because each department is different.

Elster noted that the Faculty Handbook requires that departments distribute merit raises according to their merit evaluation process; now, from the top, you have mandated a different approach. Are you saying our merit evaluations don't count? Coming from the top and changing the rules is like changing your grading scale in the middle of the quarter. You are distributing merit pay in a way that does not follow the Faculty Handbook. Descutner responded that those evaluations were consulted by chairs and directors to decide who was deserving of merit raises. **Elster** responded that therefore every department should do merit according to their policy, and

not be constrained by new mandates from the administration. Descutner said he didn't see how this was any different. **John Gilliom** said that the change is that the person who had been given a 9 on a 10-point scale got \$1600, but the person with an 8.8 didn't get anything. That's a post-hoc rewriting of merit raises. Descutner replied that was always disconcerting that there was a cut line. **Debatin** responded that the issue is not that there is a cut line; the point is that we have an established process that originates in departments and schools, determined by a written procedure that we are supposed to follow. This results in meritorious list of faculty. Then all of a sudden, it's mandated by administration that only 30% of faculty can be meritorious. So if half of my faculty are meritorious by the established peer process, I have to arbitrarily introduce extra and *post hoc* criteria to make decisions to eliminate 20% of faculty who have already been determined to deserve merit. That is why people are upset; it cuts into the integrity of the merit process.

James Casebolt corrected Descutner's premise that Dean Ogles was only dean who had a problem with this – regional faculty were told that all the regional campus deans were against this, and they were able to negotiate a slightly different system. **Eugene Ammarell** pointed out that this raised serious issues of faculty governance. In addition, many faculty may now have no incentive to even try for a merit raise. **Brown** said that we agree that the bottom line is that there are many ways of implementing merit raises; so why did this administration pick the one way that would anger and alienate so many faculty, and why did no one in administration consult faculty about this issue? **Ann Fidler** responded that the timing was difficult; EVPP Benoit did not intend that she wouldn't have time to talk to people, but after she talked to Deans, she went into hospital and has not been back. But **McLaughlin** noted that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meets every month with the Provost's office; we asked Benoit what was going on with this, and she said they had just begun discussions and had nothing to report. The next day, apparently the Deans made some decisions. Similarly, at the last Senate meeting, Benoit could have talked about this as well. When the Executive Committee met with the deans, the deans were convinced that a decision had already been made. **McLaughlin** added that one of the things he's been most pleased with in working with Benoit has been the level of consultation, but there had been no consultation at all in this case. Descutner agreed that it would not have hurt to have had consultation, but that the decision would not have been any different.

Hicks argued that a cut line isn't just "hard," it's unfair: a merit evaluation cannot take into account all the different parameters that are necessary without a margin for error. **Robert Knight** added that the difference in his department between highest and lowest evaluation scores is 8%; that's not a significant difference, and here a sliding merit scale is fair. **Beth Quitslund** asked whether Descutner had a comment on Perry's reference to merit raises as based on "exceptional instruction." **James Lein** noted that this process penalizes what researchers do, which is to take risks. Empirical research takes time, but why do it if there's no incentive for long term investigation. **Sherrie Gradin** added that for most faculty, we don't have a problem with merit raises, or trying to retain great faculty. What we do feel is that given the state of morale, and the economic decline, that this basically sends most of the people who are doing the grunt work of this institution the message that what you do doesn't matter. That's the perception: why bother? **Michael Sisson** asked why the merit pool was exclusively for group I faculty. Descutner said that \$750,000 was for group I; the second pool announced recently of \$100,000 was available for group II as well.

IV. Roll Call and Approval of the September 20, 2010 Minutes

A quorum was present. The minutes of the September 20, 2010 meeting were approved by voice vote.

V. Chair's Report – Joe McLaughlin

- If you can not be here for the monthly meeting, contact Laura Tuck as far in advance as possible. She will arrange for an official alternate.

- Merit Raise Pool Distribution

McLaughlin noted that the issues had been covered in the discussion with Descutner. One of main concerns was the process for determining how merit would be distributed. It is important for the Provost to hear how this is being perceived, and to understand the unintended consequences of this decision: it has been a blow for morale, and has impacted the student experience.

- We will hear a report on the new SSI formula in November. We also hope to have a brief presentation on statistics on status of women faculty on campus.

- Update on the environmental scan: In addition to university scan, all planning units and colleges have put together their own scans.

Forums on the draft environmental scan will be held:

- * **October 26, 12:00 – 1:30 p.m., 205 Baker** (Multicultural Multipurpose Room). This forum also will be webcast <http://streaming.cns.ohiou.edu/provost/>

- ***October 27, 4:00 – 5:30 p.m., 235 Walter Hall**

- Ohio Faculty Council:

Ann Paulins was nominated to serve, with Ken Hicks as alternate. Both were elected by voice vote. Paulins gave a brief presentation on the most recent Ohio Faculty Council meeting:

1. Vice-Chancellor Brighton is vacating his position on the Ohio Board of Regents; Stephanie Davidson, who is currently Vice-Chancellor for program review, will take over Vice-Chancellor Brighton's duties and continue her own. Two draft documents are circulating that were forwarded to members of the Ohio Faculty Council in response to information VC Davidson shared with them in September. These are: *General Education Guidelines* (dated May 3, 2010) and *Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Review* (dated May 4, 2010). These documents have been forwarded to David Thomas for distribution to UCC members. I have inquired to Rudy Fenwick, chair of OFC for information about the plans to finalize and implement these guidelines.
2. A resolution to support House Bill 365 was discussed and tabled. OFC members present desired more input by both faculty and graduate student constituents prior to voting as a Council. HB 365 would allow graduate students and "Adjunct" faculty to meet to discuss working conditions and pay, without fear of losing their jobs. This effectively allows these currently excluded groups to legally form a union. (NOTE: this does not mean that graduate students and adjunct faculty would be recognized as the same group). We were asked to vote on a resolution to give OFC support to this bill, but the motion was tabled until next month, so that we could discuss this with our respective institutions. Contact Paulins, Hicks, or McLaughlin with your input about whether to support this resolution.
3. There was a short review of proposed changes to the Ohio STRS benefits. Changes will take place on August 1, 2015.
 - * benefits will be based on top 5 years, not top 3 earning years
 - * The "bump" in benefits at 35 yrs service will be eliminatedFor retirees, in July 2011: the cost-of-living increase will be 1.5% (down from 2%).

4. Several other institutions (notably Toledo and OSU) announced academic restructuring activities. With respect to transitions to semesters, OSU reps noted that they are considering the possibility to have a short term between the end of semesters and the

beginning of summer session. Other universities indicated that they do this now; called "May-mesters", this is a 4-week term where intensive classes could be offered.

- **A Resolution on Process to Determine Necessity of Furloughs**

McLaughlin explained that he received a draft of the furlough policy Friday morning; there is about a week to provide feedback. State law requires that a furlough policy be in place before a furlough can be implemented; a furlough is not currently planned, but could be a tool if a short-term budget crisis arises. This resolution is being introduced for two reasons: First, it is important to spell out what consultation means in this case. Second, a furlough is a one-time pay cut, which is a serious matter. Pay raises go before the Board of Trustees, so pay cuts through furloughs should receive similar consideration. At the same time, circumstances that lead to the need for a furlough can arise quickly, so the process has to be streamlined. This resolution is modeled on process already contained in the Faculty Handbook for declaring a financial crisis: it charges Budget Planning Council (BPC) to issue a report on whether or not there should be a furlough; it then sends this report to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for a final decision.

Senators discussed whether financial exigency should be required before furloughs could be implemented. Some Senators argued that declaring financial exigency allows many other processes to occur (such as eliminating tenured faculty), and should be reserved for drastic situations, while furloughs are meant to address temporary deficits. Senators also noted that we may still address other problematic issues related to both the draft furlough policy and any furlough implementation, but that it was important to get feedback in now.

The rules were suspended by voice vote, and the resolution moved to second reading.

Senators supported a similar role for BPC in any implementation of a furlough; this will be included in a cover letter with the resolution.

The resolution was approved by voice vote.

- **Upcoming Senate Meeting: November 15, 2010. 7:10 p.m., Walter Hall 235**

VI. Finance and Facilities Committee (F&F)—John Gilliom

- **Sense of the Senate Resolution on 2010 Raise Pool Procedures (First Reading)**

Gilliom noted that the resolution formalized the arguments that were made to the Provost's office and Deans. Gilliom accepted some friendly amendments to clarify language. Bernhard Debatin read a statement from the AAUP in support of the resolution, and urged faculty to participate in the union card drive. The rules were suspended, and the resolution moved to second reading. The motion was approved by secret ballot (33 in favor, 4 against, no abstentions).

VII. Professional Relations Committee (PRC)—Sherrie Gradin

- Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave and Deferral for Curricular Reasons (First Reading)

- Resolution on Role of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Professional Ethics Violations (First Reading)

Due to the late hour, the first readings of these resolutions were postponed to the next meeting.

VIII. Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T)—Joe Slade

Due to the late hour, the P&T report was postponed until the next meeting.

IX. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (EPSA)—Allyn Reilly

Due to the late hour, the EPSA report was postponed until the next meeting

X. New Business

None.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:05 p.m.

Resolution on Process to Determine Necessity of Furloughs

Executive Committee

Approved October 18, 2010

Whereas the University is developing a policy that would allow it to furlough employees in order to address a short-term operating deficit; and

Whereas the University already has a process (Appendix A) to determine whether a financial crisis necessitates the declaration of a state of financial exigency (*Faculty Handbook* II.D.4.d.i-iii); and

Be it resolved that the process to determine the necessity for enacting a furlough ~~parallels~~ should resemble ~~sembles~~ the already existing policy to determine the need for declaring financial exigency. The draft furlough policy circulated to the campus should be revised to read as follows:

5. Consultation Regarding the Need for a Furlough

a. If circumstances suggest that a significant operating budget deficit may have developed or is developing, the President shall ~~appoint a committee to investigate~~ charge the Budget Planning Council with investigating the need for implementing a furlough. ~~The majority of the committee shall be faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate, but it shall also contain representatives from the other Senates (Administrative, Classified, Graduate Student, and Student) selected by their respective Senates.~~ The committee Council shall issue its a recommendation and report to the President within ten (10) calendar days of ~~its creation~~ receiving its charge.

b. ~~The committee report, along with any recommendations from the Faculty, Administrative, Classified, Student, and Graduate Student Senates,~~ President's recommendation for a furlough, along with the report from the Budget Planning Council, shall be considered by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, which shall determine whether a furlough be implemented.

Be it further resolved that this resolution, if approved, should be forwarded directly to the Board of Trustees.

Appendix A

Faculty Handbook (II.D.4.d.i-iii): Process for Determining Financial Exigency

- i. After informing the Trustees of the approaching financial crisis and before proposing a state of financial exigency, the Administration of the University, in consultation with the Faculty and Administrative Senates, shall propose and carry out all possible reductions of University activities that are not of primary importance to the educational mission of the University.
- ii. If the reductions undertaken in (i) do not resolve the problem, the President shall appoint a committee to investigate the need for declaring financial exigency. The majority of the committee shall be faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate, but it shall also contain administrators chosen by the Administrative Senate and students chosen by the Student Senate. This committee shall issue its report within four weeks of its creation.
- iii. The committee report, along with any recommendations from the Faculty, Administrative and Student Senates, shall be considered by the Trustees before determining whether a state of financial exigency exists.

A Sense of the Senate Resolution on the 2010 Raise Pool Procedures Finance & Facilities Committee Passed October 18, 2010

Whereas the recognition of faculty and staff performance through adequate compensation is a critical part of building an outstanding university by attracting and retaining a strong academic workforce;

Whereas the Faculty Handbook mandates that salary increases based on merit follow the annual peer evaluation process following written criteria and procedures of schools and departments;¹ and

Whereas faculty compensation initiatives announced in September and October of 2010 have been imposed in a hasty and capricious manner which

- excluded consultation with the Faculty Senate,
- ignored and displaced orderly and consistent evaluation and compensation procedures in some departments and colleges,
- undermined ongoing departmental and college policies and initiatives, and
- violated the principles of transparency, unit responsibility, and shared governance;

¹ “Annually, departmental chairpersons shall evaluate all members of their faculty with regard to salary. Each chairperson shall employ a departmental committee or committees in the evaluation process, which shall conform to the department's established written procedures. This evaluation process must result in recommendations with respect to salary increases for all faculty.” (Faculty Handbook, II.E.1)

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Ohio University stands in protest against the manner in which these initiatives were implemented and urges the college deans, the Provost, and the President to recommit to the values of orderly and transparent governance.

**Resolution on Faculty Fellowship Leave and
One-year Deferral for Curricular Reasons
Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate
First Reading Postponed to November 15, 2010**

Whereas, faculty who defer Fellowship Leave for one year in order to support curriculum integrity within their department or unit are currently penalized for their good citizenship;

Whereas, a change in language would act as an incentive for faculty to consider deferral of one year for purposes of maintaining curricular integrity;

Whereas, it would help alleviate a backlog of Fellowship Leaves in departments and colleges;

Whereas, the state code 3345.28 references time between granted leaves ["A faculty member who has been granted professional leave shall complete another seven years of service at the college, university, or branch at which he is employed before he becomes eligible for another grant of professional leave at that college, university, or branch"];

Be it resolved that the language in the Faculty Handbook Section V. A. 2, 7, and 8 and the Endnotes be changed to:

V. UNIVERSITY FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, RESEARCH GRANTS, AND AWARDS

A. University Faculty Fellowships

2. At the end of each seven-year teaching period at Ohio University, each tenured faculty member having faculty status shall be eligible for a University Fellowship leave. Department chairpersons accrue time toward eligibility in the same way as other members. All academic service to Ohio University will count toward eligibility regardless of the rank, campus, or overseas program at which it was performed. Every faculty member who has taken a University Fellowship leave shall complete another seven years of service at Ohio University before he/she shall become eligible for another University Fellowship grant [1]. *An exception will be granted when an approved leave is deferred for one year in order to maintain curricular integrity. In such cases, the next eligibility starts after seven years of service from the originally approved Faculty Fellowship Leave [2].*

7. A faculty member who does not wish to apply for a University Faculty Fellowship the year he/she becomes eligible or who is denied a University Fellowship for any reasons, will not lose his/her eligibility and may apply in the following years. If a faculty member is denied a University Fellowship for the convenience of the department, in spite of the fact that his/her proposal merits approval, *every effort will be made to ensure that this denial is not continued*

another year. In the case of a one-year deferral for purposes of curricular integrity, the next eligibility starts after seven years of service from the originally approved Faculty Fellowship Leave.

8. Upon completion of a University Fellowship leave, a faculty member starts accruing time toward eligibility for the award of his/her next University Faculty Fellowship as of the date of his/her resumption of normal academic duties. *Except under the circumstance noted above in the case of deferral for one year for the purposes of curriculum integrity, in which case the eligibility starts after seven years of service from the originally approved Faculty Fellowship Leave*, he/she does not begin to accrue time toward another Fellowship while the Fellowship for which he/she is already eligible is delayed either voluntarily or through denial of leave.

Endnotes

[1] See Board of Trustees' policy amendment of October, 1977 providing implementation guidelines, Appendix A.

[2] *In cases where this exception is enacted, for purposes of official record keeping the Chair/Director is required to provide both the Dean's office and the Provost's office with an official memo indicating that this action has been taken.*

[3] Example Leave Pay Schedule, for \$48,000 9-month salary:

Resolution on Responsibility of Chairs/Directors in Responding to Ethics Violations Professional Relations Committee of the Faculty Senate First Reading Postponed to November 15, 2010

Whereas, in cases of apparent violations of professional ethics not involving Research Misconduct, the Faculty handbook specifically indicates fifteen (15) to thirty (30) day time limitations in which the College Dean, the College Professional Ethics Committee, the Provost, the Professional Relations Committee, and the accused must act on, investigate, or respond to the ethical misconduct allegations;

Whereas, the Faculty Handbook does not contain a defined timetable in which Department Chairs, School Directors, or Division Coordinators must investigate the allegations and attempt to resolve the problem between the complainant and the accused;

Be it resolved that, the language in the Faculty Handbook Section IV, L.2.b (Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Violation of Professional Ethics) be changed to:

Cases of apparent violations of professional ethics not involving Research Misconduct should be brought to the attention of the department Chair^[1]. The Chair, possibly in consultation with

faculty colleagues or a departmental grievance/advisory committee, shall investigate the allegations. The person accused of the violation of professional ethics will be informed of the charges ***within thirty (30) days*** and be given an opportunity to explain his/her behavior. If the Chair is not satisfied with the explanation, the specifics of the allegations will be given ***within fifteen (15) days*** to the person accused in writing. The person accused will have fifteen (15) days to respond to the Chair in writing and the Chair will attempt to resolve the problem. If resolution cannot be reached between the Chair, the complainant, and the accused ***within fifteen (15) days***, the Chair will forward the specific allegations of violation of Professional Ethics by the faculty member, along with appropriate documentation, to the Dean in writing. The faculty member accused will be given the option of submitting his/her explanation of the alleged misconduct in writing as part of the documentation submitted to the Dean at the same time. If the Dean, Chair, the complainant, and faculty member accused of the violation cannot reach a resolution of the matter within fifteen (15) days, the specific allegations of violation of Professional Ethics along with appropriate documentation will be forwarded to the College Professional Ethics Committee. A final copy of the allegations will be given to the accused, and once the allegations are forwarded to the College Professional Ethics Committee, no additional charges can be added without beginning the process anew.

[1] Department Chair is equivalent to School Director, Division Coordinator at the Regional Campuses, or the Associate Director of the Voinovich School.